REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on October 29, 2010. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the foregoing amendment in light of the following remarks.

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action mailed on October 29, 2010, claims 13-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-5 and 8-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. PG-Pub No. 2003/0014368 to Leurig (hereinafter referred to as "Leurig") in view of U.S. PG-Pub No. 2003/0172148 to Simpson (hereinafter referred to as "Simpson"). No other issues were raised.

Status of the Application

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-2, 4, 8-9, 11 and 13-17 will have been amended, and claims 18-21 will have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-5 and 8-21 remain pending in the application.

Rejection of Claims 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 13-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter (*see, e.g.,* pages 2-3 of Office Action). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 13 was rejected for allegedly being drawn to non-statutory subject matter because the scope of the claim was interpreted as meaning that "the storage medium can include a signal or a wave" (page 3 of Office Action).

Without acceding to these grounds for rejection, Applicant is nonetheless amending claim 13 herewith, in the interests of expediting prosecution, to recite that the computer readable medium is "non-transitory," thus excluding transitory media such as signals or waves from the scope of the claim. Accordingly, claim 13 is believed to be in compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 in being drawn to statutory subject matter. Claims 14-17 are being similarly amended, and thus are also believed to be in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 101.

The rejection of claims 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is, therefore, respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-5 and 8-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Leurig and Simpson

Claims 1-5 and 8-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Leurig and Simpson (*see, e.g.,* pages 2-11 of Office Action). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is not obvious over the teachings of Leurig and Simpson, because neither of the references teaches or suggests a method executed by a server capable of communicating with a client device and a printer device through a network, the server, *the client device and the printer device each being a different device from the other*, the method comprising:

"receiving a printing request from the client device;

transmitting print data to the printer device *without going through the client device*, in accordance with the received printing request; and

transmitting, to the client device, address information for causing the client device to acquire, *from the printer device without going through the server*, a Web page provided by the printer device, the Web page indicating a state of processing of the transmitted print data, *wherein the client device acquires the Web page from the printer device in accordance with the address information*

and displays the state of processing of the print data in accordance with the Web
page" (emphasis added), as recited in the claim.

Embodiments of the method as claimed thus provide for a server to
receive a print request from a client device, and then transmit the print data to a
printer device _without going through the client device_. However, because the
print data is transmitted to the printer device without going through the client
device, a user of the client device may not be able to readily ascertain a state of
processing of the print data. Thus, according to aspects of the method as
claimed, the server _transmits address information to the client apparatus_ for
causing the client apparatus to acquire, _from the printer device without going_
through the server, a Web page provided by the printer device. The Web page
indicates the state of processing of the print data by the printer device. The client
device acquired the Web page from the printer device in accordance with the
address information from the server, and displays the state of processing of the
print data in accordance with the Web page. Accordingly, the user of the client
device can be updated on the state of processing of the print data by the printer
device, even when print data is not directly transmitted from the client device to
the printer device but is instead transmitted indirectly via the server, and without
having to request such update information from the server (_see, e.g.,_ paragraphs
[0055]-[0056] and Fig. 6 of the publication of the instant application).

The method of claim 1 is patentable over the teachings of Leurig, because
Leurig does not teach or suggest a method executed by a server in
communication with a client device and printer device, each of the server, client
device and printer devices being different devices, and in which print data _is_
transmitted from the server to the printer device without going through the client
device, and then _address information is transmitted from the server to the client_
device to cause the client device to acquire a Web page from the printer device
without going through the server, wherein a state of processing of the print data
is displayed on the client device in accordance with the Web page. Leurig

teaches a secure system for printing negotiable instruments using a central server that authorizes the printing (*see, e.g.,* Abstract). In particular, Leurig teaches that a client 108 submits a print job to a server 104 (*see, e.g.,* step 310 of Fig. 3) and also transmits a print request to the server 104 (*see, e.g.,* step 312 of Fig. 3). Upon receiving the print request, the server 104 formats the print job with an appropriate format (*see, e.g.,* step 330 of Fig. 3), generates an appropriate data file (*see, e.g.,* step 330 of Fig. 3) and transmits the data file back to the client 108 (*see, e.g.,* step 318 of Fig. 3). The client 108 processes the data file (*see, e.g.,* step 332 of Fig. 3) and transmits the data file to the printer 110 (*see, e.g.,* step 320 of Fig. 3). The printer 110 then prints the data file and transmits a status response to the client 108 (*see, e.g.,* step S322 of Fig. 3).

In other words, Leurig teaches a system in *which the server 104 transmits print data to the client 108, after which the client 108 transmits the print data to the printer 110*. The printer 110 receives the print data from the client 108 and transmits the status to the client 108 in response to the print data. Thus, Leurig teaches transmitting print data from a server to a printer *via a client*, but Leurig does not teach or suggest transmitting print data from a server to a printer device *without going through the client device*, as in the method as claimed.

Furthermore, as would be apparent to those of ordinary skill in the art, even if the server 104 of Leurig were to be modified such that it did not transmit the print data to the client 108, and instead transmitted the print data to the printer 110 without going through the client, then *the printer 110 would not transmit the print status to the client 108*, because the printer 110 would instead transmit the print status to the server 104 in response to having received the print data from the server 104. Thus, even if this modification were made, the client 108 of Leurig would not be able to recognize that the print data had been transmitted to the printer 110, and thus would not have an opportunity to acquire the status of processing of the print data from the printer 110, in contrast to the method as claimed.

Simpson does not make up for the deficiencies of Leurig. Simpson teaches a printing system having a client computer and a printer that allows a user of the computer to download Web content provided by the printer (*see, e.g.,* Abstract). In particular, Simpson teaches that "the printer 106 includes an embedded Web server (print server) 132" (paragraph [0036]), which embedded Web server 132 serves a program that provides print service (PS) Web content 136 to enable a client to print a document (*see, e.g.,* paragraphs [0036]-[0037]). Simpson teaches that when a user of client 104 requests the PS web content 136 from a web browser 124 (*see, e.g.,* step 306 in Fig. 3), the web browser 124 retrieves the PS web content 136 from the web server 132 (*see, e.g.,* step 308). Simpson further teaches that the PS web content 136 displays a graphical user interface that allows the user to selected printing options and a "go to print" button (*see, e.g.,* step 404 of Fig. 4A). When the user presses the "go to print" button, the PS web content creates a print job (*see, e.g.,* step 411 of Fig. 4A), and transmits the print job to the printer 106 (*see, e.g.,* step 412 of Fig. 4A). Simpson teaches that the PS web content 136 can query the printer 106 to determine the present status of the print job (*see, e.g.,* paragraph [0048]). Simpson also teaches that the PS web content 136 receives the response from the printer 106 (*see, e.g.,* step 461 of Fig. 4B) and displays a web page that indicates the present status of the print job (*see, e.g.,* step 420 of Fig. 4B).

Accordingly, in the system of Simpson, a client *directly* transmits a print job to the printer, without using a server that is a separate device from the printer (i.e., by selecting the "go to print" option on the graphical user interface displayed by the PS web content), after which the client can receive a response from the printer as to the status. However, Simpson does not teach or suggest *transmitting print data from a server to a printer device without going through the* *client device*, as in the method as claimed.

Furthermore, as would be understood by those of ordinary skill in the art, even if the teachings of Simpson were modified to provide a separate server that transmits the print job to the printed without going through the client, *the printer would not be capable of transmitting the response and web page indicating the print status to the client*, in contrast to the method as claimed, because the printer would instead transmit the response and web page to the server from which it received the print data. This is because Simpson does not teach or suggest a server that transmits address information for such the web page to a client, and thus any such web page would be displayed by the server requesting the print job, and not the client.

Accordingly, as neither Leurig nor Simpson teach or suggest the method as claimed, in which print data *is transmitted from the server to the printer device without going through the client device*, and then *address information is transmitted from the server to the client device* to cause the client device to acquire a Web page from the printer device *without going through the server*, wherein a state of processing of the print data is displayed on the client device in accordance with the Web page, it is considered that the method of claim 1 is patentable over the teachings of the references.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, and thus are also allowable over the teachings of Leurig and Simpson for at least the same reasons as their base claim.

Claim 8 is similar to claim 1, in that it is directed to an information processing device capable of communicating with an external device and a printer device through a network, the information processing device, *the external device and the printer device each being a different device from the other*, the information processing device comprising:

"a request receiving unit configured to receive a printing request from the external device;

a data transmission unit configured to transmit print data to the printer device _without going through the external device_ in accordance with the printing request received by the request receiving unit;

a transmission unit configured to transmit, to the external device, address information for causing the external device to acquire, _from the printer device without going through the information processing device_, a Web page provided by the printer device, the Web page indicating a state of processing of the print data transmitted by the data transmission unit, _wherein the external device acquires the Web page from the printer device in accordance with the address information and displays the state of processing of the print data in accordance with the Web page_" (emphasis added).

Accordingly, claim 8 is also considered to be allowable over the teachings of Leurig and Simpson for reasons that are the same as and/or similar to those discussed for claim 1 above, and namely as neither of the references teaches or suggests that print data _is transmitted from the information processing device to the printer device without going through the external device_, and then _address information is transmitted from the server to the external device_ to cause the external device to acquire a Web page from the printer device _without going through the information processing device_, wherein a state of processing of the print data is displayed on the external device in accordance with the Web page. Claims 9-12 depend from claim 8, and thus are also allowable over the teachings of Leurig and Simpson for at least the same reasons as their base claim.

Claim 13 is directed to a non-transitory computer-readable medium having a program stored thereon for controlling a computer of a server capable of communicating with an external device and a printer device, the program causing the computer to execute a method corresponding to that recited in claim 1, and thus claim 13 is also considered to be patentable over the teachings of Leurig and Simpson for reasons that are the same as and/or similar to those discussed for claim 1 above. Claims 14-17 depend from claim 13, and thus are also

patentable over the teachings of Leurig and Simpson for at least the same reasons as their base claim.

The rejection of claims 1-5 and 8-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Leurig and Simpson is, therefore, respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Newly Added Claims 18-21

Claims 18-21 are being added with the present amendment, and do not add any new matter.

Furthermore, it is noted that claim 18 depends from claim 8, and thus is considered to be allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons, discussed above, as its base claim.

Newly added claim 19 is also considered to be patentable over the references of record, because the references do not teach or suggest an information processing device capable of communicating with an external device and a printer device through a network, _the information processing device, the external device and the printer device each being a different device from the other_, the information processing device comprising:

"a request receiving unit configured to receive a printing request from the external device;

a data transmission unit configured to transmit print data to the printer device _without going through the external device_, in accordance with the printing request received by the request receiving unit;

a transmission unit configured to transmit, to the external device, a Web page, the Web page indicating a state of processing of the print data transmitted by the data transmission unit, wherein the external device displays the state of processing of the print data in accordance with the Web page" (emphasis added), as recited in the claim.

Newly added claims 20-21 depend from claim 19, and thus are also considered to be patentable for at least the same reasons as their base claim.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability, and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims. Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 502456. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

2/25/2011   /Abigail Cotton/

Date   Abigail Cotton, Reg. No. 52,773
                                             Patent Agent for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731

Telephone: (949) 932-3351
Fax: (949) 932-3560